

Michael Thomas
Assistant Executive Officer
Central Coast Water Board
895 Aerovista place, Ste 101
San Luis Obispo, Ca. 93401

Re: Proposed cease and Desist Orders against individual property owners and tenants in Los Osos
/ Baywood Park Prohibition Zone-Presentation of Prosecution's Case

- 1) Must the prosecution case as presented orally on 4/28/2006, be stricken entirely or to some lesser degree?

If any portion of Ms. Okun's influence on this case is to be stricken then all of her influence must be removed including her decision to issue CDO's to individual property owners and tenants. We believe that the only way to start over is that the prosecution's case should be re-started from the beginning without issuing CDO's and with providing sufficient time for the Prohibition Zone residents and land owners and the Board to comply with 83-12(septic system management and water conservation).

We believe that the current prosecution team by issuing CDO's to individual property owners and tenants have the agenda of forcing the will of the people in the Prohibition Zone to accept an outrageously expensive and extremely dangerous and flawed design by MWH ,which threatens to pollute our National Estuary with raw sewage as well as threatens many homes and potential deaths to residents by dumping 800,000 gallons of water per day on the Broderson property above Highland Dr. (that's 800,000 gal of water x8lbs of sand equaling 6,400,000.lbs of water and sand coming down the hillside.)

This expensive project by MWH supposedly is justified by 83-13 after 23 years with no mechanism in place nor effort to force compliance of 83-12. 83-12 which was decreed before 83-13 was an intelligent attempt to protect water quality and the preservation of that valuable resource.83-12 has everything to do with protection of water quality and preservation of that natural resource.

Bruce Payne believes that: 83-13, the Water Board, Recalled CSD Board, County Supervisors, and the Honorable Judge Hilton and Appellant court all have committed illegal acts in partnership with MWH to swindle the Los Osos Prohibition zone residents, which includes many of the most vulnerable people (elderly on fixed incomes etc) and all based on known fraudulent data collected from illegal test wells. (See Glen Stillman's Affidavit of Dec14,1983 internal memo where the RWQCB's advising staff on test wells.)

- 2) If the prosecution is required to present its case again, should it have the opportunity to introduce additional written material into the record before the Water Board?

Both or Neither.

- 3) If the prosecution is allowed to supplement the written materials that it has introduced, should designated parties be entitled to submit additional written materials?

Both or Neither.

- 4) If the prosecution case is stricken entirely or to some lesser degree, should the Los Osos Community Services District be permitted to start its case over?

Ask & Answered See 2&3.

- 5) Designated parties with personal issues like childcare and health, that would like the Water Board Chairman to consider when setting the order of presentation of the Proposed Individual Cease and Desist Orders should put such issues in writing for submission by June 23,2006.

Of course they should.

We object to the statement made by Chairman Jeffrey Young on May 11,2006 at the CDO Hearing that the Water Board may make a decision of prosecution before hearing All defense from every CDO recipient. Those who want to defend themselves or those recipients who accept their CDO.

Under no circumstances does anyone relinquish their right to appeal any hearing decision made by the RWQCB or the State Resource Control Water Board.

Sincerely,

Bruce and Antoinette Payne
1061 Green Oaks Dr
Los Osos, Ca . 93402
CDO#R3-2006-1000